



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5433		
Country/Region:	Mozambique		
Project Title:	Strengthening Capacities of Agricultural Producers to Cope with Climate Change for Increased Food Security through the Farmers Field School Approach		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$9,000,000
Co-financing:	\$30,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$39,200,000
PIF Approval:	September 25, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Caterina Batello

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	YES. Mozambique is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point of Mozambique and dated March 11, 2013, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The proposed grant is available	

		principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	YES. The proposed project contributes directly towards the implementation of Mozambique's NAPA, particularly the priority area on strengthening the adaptive capacities of agricultural producers. The project is further aligned with national plans for the achievement of MDGs and objective 1(c) in particular, as well as the Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agricultural Sector and the Food Security and Nutrition Strategy.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	YES. The proposed LDCF grant would directly build on an (i) FAO-implemented and EU-sponsored contribution to the initiative, 'Accelerate progress towards MDG1c in Mozambique'; the (ii) FAO-implemented project 'Protecting and improving household food security and nutrition in HIV/AIDS affected areas in Manica and Sofala provinces'; and the (iii) IFAD-financed 'PRONEA Support	

Project Design		<p>build on and strengthen ongoing efforts by the Ministry of Agriculture in the context of the Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agricultural Sector, as well as activities of the National Meteorological Institute.</p> <p>While the baseline projects and activities represent a concerted effort to enhance agricultural productivity and food security in Mozambique, they do not adequately incorporate the knowledge, technologies and resources necessary to address climate change adaptation.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Given that component 2 would seem to focus on training, it is not clear why it is treated as INV in the project framework. Component 1, on the other hand, appears to include the only tangible investments associated with the proposed project.</p> <p>Moreover, output 1.1.4 could be clarified, consistent with the description of Component 1 on p. 10 of the PIF. (See also Section 8 below.)</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) consider treating Component 2 as TA and, if appropriate, Component 1 as INV; and (ii) clarify output 1.1.4 to ensure consistency with the description of Component 1 in Section A.1 of the PIF.</p> <p>06/07/2013 -- YES. The Project Framework has been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning	NOT CLEAR. On the whole the additional reasoning is clearly presented and the adaptation benefits have been adequately identified for this stage of	

		<p>With respect to Component 1, however, it is not entirely clear how the project would provide 50,000 smallholder farmers with increased access to agricultural inputs for climate change adaptation, as suggested in the project framework (Output 1.1.4). This does not appear to be reflected in the description of Component 1 on p. 10, which focuses on knowledge services, planning and targeted pilots.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how the project would provide 50,000 smallholder farmers with increased access to agricultural inputs for climate change adaptation.</p> <p>06/07/2013 -- YES. The additional reasoning, particularly the proposed activities under Component 1, has been adequately clarified in the re-submission.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and  b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would adopt a highly participatory approach, working with more than 50,000 smallholder farmers through Farmer Field Schools.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, the role of local and national CSOs could be further explored.</p>	

	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately identified for this stage of project development.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination and coherence with other related initiatives, notably SPCR, has been adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up</b> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	YES. Innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up have been adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.	

Project Financing	and outputs?	addressing the recommendation under Section 8, please adjust the indicative grant and co-financing figures accordingly, if necessary.  06/07/2013 -- YES. The GEF funding and co-financing amounts per component are adequate and appropriate.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	YES. At \$30 million, the indicative amount of co-financing is adequate. Of this, \$22.1 million would be provided by FAO or through projects managed by FAO.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	YES. At \$400,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1-4, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. \$200,000 is requested, consistent with the norm for projects up to and including \$10 million.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results		

Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 7, 8 and 16.  06/07/2013 -- YES. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.  09/24/2013 -- YES.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to Section 10.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	May 23, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 07, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 24, 2013	

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**